District 4 Bicycle Advisory Committee (D4 BAC)
Minutes
April 18, 2012
1:30 PM – 3:30 PM
D4 HQ, 111 Grand Ave, Oakland, Mountain View Room, 15th Floor

Members Present (incl. teleconference attendees):
Paul Goldstein, Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition, D4 BAC Chair
Rick Marshall, Napa County Public Works, Vice Chair
Michelle De Robertis, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
Bruce "Ole" Ohlson, East Bay Bicycle Coalition, Delta Pedalers
Leo DuBose, East Bay Bicycle Coalition, Alameda County
Bert Hill, San Francisco Bicycle Coalition
Alan Forkosh, CA Association of Bicycling Organizations (via telephone)
Carol Levine, Oakland Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee; Bay Area Bicycle Coalition

Non-Members Present (incl. teleconference attendees):
Ina Gerhard, Caltrans District 4 Bicycle Coordinator
Pat Giorni, Burlingame resident (via telephone)
Scott Kelsey, Consultant, URS
Marty Martinez, Safe Routes to School National Partnership
Craig Copelan, Caltrans HQ, Traffic Safety Research Branch
Anh P. Nguyen, Caltrans District 4 Pedestrian Coordinator
Alana Hitchcock, Caltrans HQ, Complete Streets (via telephone)

1. **Welcome and Introductions**

2. **Approval of January 18, 2012 Meeting Minutes**
   http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/transplanning/docs/d4bacmom011812.pdf

Comments on the minutes:

- Chair Goldstein requested to see the public comments submitted for the Caltrans review of the Napa County Bicycle Plan.
- Item 6 should read *reasonable* rather than *suitable* alternative to the freeway.

Due to lack of a quorum the minutes were not approved.

3. **US 101/Broadway Interchange Reconstruction Project, San Mateo County –** Scott Kelsey, URS
   http://www.burlingame.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=6749

Scott Kelsey, consultant with URS, presented the bike circulation components of the project in Burlingame.

Background: The US 101/Broadway Interchange was considered at capacity since the 1980s and included in San Mateo County Measure A funding in 1988. In 2005 the project was approved for funding and URS was hired to prepare the environment clearance. The EIR was approved in March, 2011. The project design is at 65% completion and construction is projected to begin in 2014. Total cost is $75 mill.

Challenges: To build a new interchange within the existing footprint while maintaining operational traffic flow. Constraints include the presence of PG&E overhead utility towers, hotels, gas stations, car dealerships, Caltrain station, Bayside Park, the Bay Trail, a number of creeks in the area, and incorporation of the pedestrian overcrossing (POC), originally built as a temporary structure, into the new design.

Proposed Alternative: The relocation of Broadway slightly to the north allows the replacement overpass to be constructed while the existent overpass remains in place and operational. PG & E towers and "temporary" POC will remain in place with some minor adjustments to the PUC.

Bicycle and pedestrian safety and access improvements: There will be Class II bike lanes on both sides of the overpass, and an 8' sidewalk on the north side only. Class II Bike Lanes will be added to surface streets leading to either terminus of the overpass. There are no high-speed on/off ramps, all intersection will be signalized. The main concern that was discussed is the pedestrian crossing of 8 lanes on Rollins Road. It was suggested that a pedestrian delay sensor system be installed, which detects a pedestrian still in the crosswalk and adds signal crossing time to allow the pedestrian to complete the crossing. Also, since the project is being constructed to meet projected 2035 demand, it was discussed what features could be incorporated that would make it appropriately sized for current and near-term multi-modal demand such as medians, pedestrian refuge islands. The features would remain in place unless an extra lane is indeed needed in future. Scott assured that he would look into these suggestions and share them with the project development team.

4. **New Traffic Operations Policy Directive (TOPD 11-04) -** Craig Copelan, CT HQ, Traffic Safety Studies Branch
   http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/signtech/signdel/policy/11-04.pdf

Craig Copelan presented updated HQ guidance on rumble strips, in particular shoulder rumble strips (SRS); findings from traffic studies done to develop CA SRS policies in the early 2000s; how they prevent run-off-road collisions; how they can be of advantage to bicyclists without being uncomfortable to cross or causing loss of control; and ongoing efforts to reach out to the bike community as SRS are installed on State highways around the State (example: Humboldt County SR 96).

2009 traffic studies indicated that use of both CLRS and SRS dramatically reduced collisions up to 64%. Federal guidance recommends a ½" depth for SRS. Caltrans, based on its own studies, has determined that 5/16" depth is sufficient to warn drivers that they are straying while also being shallow enough for bicyclists to cross over with no loss of control. Placement under the edge stripe allows for maximum shoulder width to be provided for bicyclists. The new guidance recommends that the bicycle community be engaged early on in SRS projects on conventional highways and arterials to help the traffic engineer determine optimum placement that will not place bicyclists at risk and will not make the road less "bikeable."

The Committee expressed several concerns:

- The new policy directive eliminated the minimum shoulder width standard (5'), (guidance was also removed from the 2012 CA MUTCD and is not included in the updated HDM), leaving it at the discretion of the traffic engineer to determine the appropriate shoulder width for each project individually. There is concern that the bicycle community will not always have the opportunity to provide input. The existing standard was working well so far and guaranteed that SRS were only placed in areas with at least 4 – 5' shoulders.
- The new policy directive was not presented to the CA Bicycle Advisory Committee (CBAC) for input as should be done when CT initiates changes to policies, practice, and guidance that affect bicycling. Committee members will inform CBAC and request that issue be presented at one of the next CBAC meetings.
- The tendency of debris to accumulate next to the SRS in the area where bicyclists usually ride and the lack of shoulder maintenance continue to be a problem with SRS.

5. Update on Caltrans Complete Streets Implementation – Alana Hitchcock, CT HQ, Complete Streets Program

Alana Hitchcock with the Complete Streets (CS) Program in CT HQ reported on the status of the CS Implementation efforts. By the end of June 2012 more than 50% of the original 74 items on the Complete Streets Implementation Action Plan will have been completed or have made significant progress. A few items were removed for various reasons leaving 15 items presently un-started.

The update Highway Design Manuel (HDM) is slated for April release. Committee members expressed concern that several critical comments on Draft 1 were not addressed and that Draft 2 was not re-circulated for public comments. Alana responded that the HDM is intended to be a living document and concerns not addressed in this update will be considered in future changes/updates.

Update of the System Planning Guidelines is underway and will be completed early this summer. The new guidelines include gathering bicycle and pedestrian facilities data and will incorporate a lot of the CS measurements as well as concepts of CT Smart Mobility Framework.

CT Landscape Architecture is updating its Main Street Guidance, which will present new design guidelines for bicycle and pedestrian circulation where State Highways serve as "Main Streets" in local communities. There may be wide circulation for comments once a final draft is completed in early fall.

Going forward, the focus will be to evaluate whether what has been accomplished to date is consistent with the intent of CT CS policy and has indeed removed barriers (maintenance issues, freeway high speed ramp impediments to local street circulation). The CS Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), with representation from all CT districts and functions, will continue to work on these issues. Ina has a seat on the TAC, which is also tasked with assessment of each CT district's plans for CS implementation.

Committee suggestions included encouraging Caltrans to consult with local and regional (f.e. Bay Trail) bicycle plans when a project is developed; also to cooperate with local Public Works directors.

6. **Update on Various Projects and Work Plan** – Ina Gerhard, CT; All
   http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/transplanning/bicyclecommittee.htm

Review, discuss, revise project matrix and work plan

- Class 1 bike path in CC 580 corridor (Richmond): Chevron has contributed funding to continue work on the Project Initiation Document.
- Niles Canyon Project (ALA 84): Meetings with large stakeholder group are ongoing; Dave Campbell (EBBC) is representing bike interests.
- Whitehall Lane Rail Crossing (NAP 29): Utilities are being undergrounded to give room for at-grade road widening for bike improvement.
- Alpine Road at SM 280: CT submitted a letter of support for San Mateo County funding application.
- Use of ALA 580 freeway shoulder: Postponed until next meeting as Dave Campbell was not present to share EBBC's position on the subject.

7. Future Agenda Items/Announcements/Adjourn

- Experience with sharrow markings through intersections: Contact David Curtis, SFMTA
- AB 2245: Proposes to add bike lane installations to the CEQA list of statutory exemptions
- Bicycle approach to Devil's Slide Tunnel
- Discussion of SR 35/Lake Merced Recreational Area

D4 BAC meeting dates in 2012:
July 18, 2012
October 17, 201